



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,514	10/23/2000	Timothy M. Moore	205724	9639

22971 7590 08/14/2006

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT  
ONE MICROSOFT WAY  
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER

ZAND, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application N .

09/694,514

Applicant(s)

MOORE ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Zand

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0609/2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 16-19, 21-26 and 33-36 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-9, 16-19, 21, 23-26 and 33-36 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6 and 22 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
KAMBIZ ZAND  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/17/2006.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this section can be found in the prior office action.
2. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.
3. Claims 10-15, 20, 27-32 have been cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 5-6, 16, 21, 22, 33, 34 have been amended.
5. Claims 1-9, 16-19, 21-26 and 33-36 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 06/09/2006 have been fully considered but they are persuasive only in the light of limitations of claims 5, 6, 22. Therefore the rejections of the claims 5-6 and 22 have been withdrawn.
7. As per applicant's arguments with respect to the "address" not shown by prior art, examiner refers applicant to consider the URL address that is well known in the art as the address that can be used in a network environment such as Internet.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement PTO-1449***

8. The Information Disclosure Statement submitted by applicant on 05/17/2006 has been considered. Please see attached PTO-1449.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

9. **Claims 1-4, 7-9, 16, 21, 23-26 and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diffie et al (5,371,794 A) in view of Luckenbaugh (5,991,877 A).

The new added limitation “limited” and “that reflects a relative security level” in the independent claims is only disclosed as definition of authenticator action and not as a positive limitation in the claim where upon such limitations an access is limited or broad. Also the added limitation “determining that ...access the computing resource” only can be positively cited in light of claims 5 and 6 or 22 (see response to arguments above; or allowability subject matters below) since such determination at the beginning of any logon is inherent part of the prior art.

**As per claims 1, 16, 20, 21 and 33** Diffie et al (5,371,794 A) disclose method, computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for providing a mobile computing machine with privileged access to a computing resource, the method comprising the steps of:

Obtaining credentials with a unique machine identifier to facilitate authenticating an identity of the mobile computing unit; providing the credentials to an authenticator to prove the machine identity. the authenticator controlling access to the computing resource; and establishing access to the computing resource using authorization information obtained from the authenticator, the authorization information corresponding to the authenticated identity of the mobile computing unit ( see abstract; fig.5a,fb and

associated text that disclose the above limitations; also the method is being used between two parties; col.2, lines 38-67; col.3-5) **but do not disclose access based on credentials for a user on asserted identity**. However Luckenbaugh (5,991,877 A) disclose **access based on credentials for a user on asserted identity** (see abstract where every object or resource are labeled; fig.1-3 and 10 and associated text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Luckenbaugh (5,991,877 A)'s access to an object method based on a user asserted identity credentials in Diffie's access method system to objects in order to control which objects are visible (accessed) to a specific user based on security policy, which objects are available for use and which level on system implementation can become transparent (see abstract).

**As per claims 2-4, 7-9 and 23-26** Diffie et al (5,371,794 A) disclose method, computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for wireless link, having mobile identifier, log-in features, given access to resources, having symmetric/asymmetric key, storing the certificate in the mobile unit (see fig. 1-5b and associated text).

**10. Claims 17-19 and 34-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diffie et al (5,371,794 A) in view of Luckenbaugh (5,991,877 A), and further in view of Ramasubramani et al (6,233,577 B1).

**As per claims 17, 28 and 34** Diffie et al (5,371,794 A) in view of Luckenbaugh (5,991,877 A) teach all limitation of the claims as applied above but do not expressly disclose using a domain controller for obtaining the certificate where the URL address is being used for receiving and sending data. However Ramasubramani et al (6,233,577 B1) disclose using a domain controller for obtaining the certificate where the URL address is being used for receiving and sending data (see fig.2 and associated text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Ramasubramani domain controller having URL in Diffie's mobile authentication method and system in view of Luckenbaugh (5,991,877 A)'s access method based on asserted identity credentials in order to use the computing resources in a server device to carry out the task of obtaining and maintaining certificates asynchronously in the proxy server using HTTP, HTML. (see abstract; and fig.2 in support of the motivation).

**As per claims 18-19 and 35-36** Diffie et al (5,371,794 A) disclose a method and a computer readable medium for receiving and using a key for encryption and decryption communications to/ and from the computing resource (see fig. 1-5b and associated text where receiving a symmetric or asymmetric key for encryption and decryption are being disclosed).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

11. **Claims 5, 6 and 22** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Conclusion**

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (571) 272-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Art Unit: 2132

supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned as 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



KAMBIZ ZAND  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

08/12/2006

AU 2132